



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,848	06/15/2001	F. David Stallworth	20009.0058US01	6723
45695 7590 08/28/2007 WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH P. O. BOX 71355 MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355			EXAMINER SHELEHEDA, JAMES R	
			ART UNIT 2623	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,848

Applicant(s)

STALLWORTH, F. DAVID

Examiner

James Sheleheda

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim is 14 objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 14 is listed on the same line as claim 13, and is missing its status identifier.

As the claim language appears unchanged, the status of the claim is being treated as "original".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul (6,381,745) (of record).

As to claim 1, while Paul discloses a system for delivering to a subscriber located on a second side of a right of way a first signal that is subject to a right-of-way franchise fee (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), the system comprising:

(a) a central office located on a first side of a right-of-way (local cable company, CATV source, 163; column 2, lines 38-46);

(b) a multiplexer in communication with the central office (Fig. 1; 115), wherein the central office transmits a second signal to the multiplexer (transmitting cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46), and wherein the multiplexer is located on the second side of the right-of-way opposite the first side such that the second signal must cross the right-of-way to reach the multiplexer (cable television signals crossing the right of way, established by local governments to pay video franchise fees, to reach the television subscribers; see Fig. 1);

(c) a wireless receiver located on the second side of the right-of-way (satellite dish, 160, located at the subscriber home; Fig. 1; column 1, lines 11-32 and column 2, lines 38-46),

wherein the wireless receiver receives the first signal and transmits the first signal to the multiplexer (column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42), wherein the multiplexer combines the second signal and the first signal into a combined signal for routing to the subscriber (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 4, lines 33-42), and wherein the combined signal is comprised of at least two of a video signal (satellite television signals and cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46) and a data signal (satellite television signals and cable television signals, as the term "data" encompasses video data; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46); and

a unit on the second side of the right of way in communication with the multiplexer (Fig. 1; diplexer, 152; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), and in communication with the subscriber (Fig. 1; diplexer, 152; column 4, lines

33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), wherein the unit separates the combined signal into the first and second signal (Fig. 1; diplexer, 152; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the unit is an optical network unit.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to utilize an optical network unit to receive, separate and route signals, so as to allow the use of fiber optic cables to distribute signals, which provides signal transmission capabilities through smaller and lighter cables, for the typical benefit of receiving and distributing multiplexed signals received from a fiber optic cable, which can carry more information than a coaxial cable.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul's system to include an optical network unit for the typical benefit of receiving and distributing multiplexed signals received from a fiber optic cable, which can carry more information than a coaxial cable.

As to claim 2, Paul discloses an optical network unit (as indicated in regards to claim 1) in communication with the multiplexer (Fig. 1), wherein the unit receives the combined signal from the multiplexer (Fig. 1; diplexer, 152; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), separates the combined signal into the first and second signal (Fig. 1; diplexer, 152; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), and routes the first signal and second signal to the subscriber (Fig. 1; diplexer, 152; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9).

As to claim 3, Paul discloses wherein the first signal is a video signal (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), and the second signal is a data signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46).

As to claim 4, Paul discloses wherein the first signal is a data signal (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), and the second signal is a video signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46).

As to claim 5, Paul discloses receiving both the second signal and the first signal from a wireless (satellite) receiver as an electronic signal (column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42) and converting the signals to optical signals for transmission across fiber optic wires (as indicated in regards to claim 1).

As to claim 6, Paul discloses wherein the wireless receiver is a radio receiver (wherein satellite dish, 160, is by definition a radio receiver, as satellite signals are radio frequency signals; Fig. 1).

As to claim 8, Paul discloses wherein the first signal is transmitted over a first wavelength and wherein the second signal is transmitted over a second wavelength that is different then from the first wavelength (wherein signals of different frequencies have different wavelengths; column 3, lines 23-27).

As to claim 10, Paul discloses wherein the right-of-way franchise fee is imposed by a local governing authority (wherein a right-of-way franchise fee is a government imposed fee).

4. Claims 11, 12, 17-21 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of Klosterman (6,072,983).

As to claim 11, while Paul discloses a system for delivering to a subscriber a first signal that is subject to a right-of-way franchise fee (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), wherein the method comprises the step of:

(a) transmitting a second signal from a first side of the right of way (transmitting cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46), through the right of way, to a second side of the right of way, wherein the first side is opposite the second side (cable television signals crossing the right of way, established by local government to pay video franchise fees, to reach the television subscribers; see Fig. 1) and wherein the second signal is comprised of at least one of a video signal and a data signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46);

(b) receiving via a wireless communication the first signal on the second side of the right-of-way such that the first signal does not pass through the right-of-way (receiving broadcast satellite signals; column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42), wherein the first signal is comprised of at least one of a video signal and data signal (broadcast satellite signals; column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42),

(c) combining the first signal and the second signal into a combined signal on the second side of the right of way (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 4, lines 33-42),

(d) routing the combined signal in the direction of the subscriber (Fig. 1; column 4, lines 39-42 and column 4, lines 59-65), wherein the subscriber is on the second side of the right-of-way (see Fig 1);

(e) separating the combined signal into the first signal and the second signal (column 4, lines 59-63); and

(f) routing the first signal and the second signal to the subscriber (column 4, lines 59-63), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the first signal does not contain the same type of signal as the second signal.

In an analogous art, Klosterman discloses a television system for receiving signals from two separate sources (Fig. 1A-B; column 3, lines 3-17) wherein each of the transmitted signals includes both video signals and other data signals (television video programming and schedule information; column 3, lines 3-17 and column 5, line 61-column 6, line 67) for the typical benefit of providing viewers with a schedule of available programming (column 1, lines 16-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul's system to include wherein the first signal does not contain the same type of signal as the second signal, as taught by Klosterman, for the typical benefit of providing viewers with additional data with their video transmissions, in the form of a schedule of available programming.

As to claim 12, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the wireless communication is satellite communication (Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 7), and wherein the step of receiving the first signal comprises receiving the first signal with a satellite receiver located on the second side of the right of way (at satellite dish, 160, at the user's home; Fig. 1; column 2, line 41-46).

As to claim 18, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the first signal is a video signal (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), and the second signal is a data signal (cable schedule signals; see Klosterman at column 3, lines 3-17).

As to claim 19, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the first signal is a data signal (satellite schedule signals; see Klosterman at column 3, lines 3-17), and the second signal is a video signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46).

As to claim 20, while Paul discloses a system for delivering to a subscriber a first signal that is subject to right-of-way franchise fees (video; column 3, lines 35-43), wherein the method comprises the step of:

(a) transmitting a second signal (transmitting cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46) from a central office (Fig. 1, 163) through a right of way (cable television signals crossing the right of way, established by local government to pay video franchise fees, to reach the television subscribers; see Fig. 1) to a

Art Unit: 2623

multiplexer (Fig. 1; 115), wherein the central office is located on a first side of the right of way and the multiplexer is located on a second side of the right of way opposite the first side (see Fig. 1) and wherein the second signal is comprised of at least one of a video signal and a data signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46),

(b) receiving the first signal at a wireless receiver (satellite dish, 160, located at the subscriber home; Fig. 1; column 1, lines 11-32 and column 2, lines 38-46), located on the second side of the right-of-way (see Fig. 1) wherein the first signal is comprised of at least one of a video signal and data signal (broadcast satellite signals; column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42),

(c) transmitting the first signal from the wireless receiver to the multiplexer (column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42) without crossing the right of way (wherein both are located at the subscriber home; see Fig. 1);

(d) combining the first signal and the second signal into a combined signal at the multiplexer (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 4, lines 33-42);

(e) routing the combined signal from the multiplexer to a local terminal (satellite adaptor, 150; Fig. 1; column 4, lines 39-42 and column 4, lines 59-65), that is located on the second side of the right of way (see Fig. 1);

(f) separating the combined signal into the first signal and the second signal at the local terminal (column 4, lines 59-63); and

(f) routing the first signal and the second signal from the local terminal to the subscriber (column 4, lines 59-63) wherein the subscriber is located on the second side

Art Unit: 2623

of the right-of-way (see Fig. 1), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the first signal does not contain the same type of signal as the second signal.

In an analogous art, Klosterman discloses a television system for receiving signals from two separate sources (Fig. 1A-B; column 3, lines 3-17) wherein each of the transmitted signals includes both video signals and other data signals (television video programming and schedule information; column 3, lines 3-17 and column 5, line 61-column 6, line 67) for the typical benefit of providing viewers with a schedule of available programming (column 1, lines 16-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul's system to include wherein the first signal does not contain the same type of signal as the second signal, as taught by Klosterman, for the typical benefit of providing viewers with additional data with their video transmissions, in the form of a schedule of available programming.

As to claim 24, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the first signal is a video signal (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), and the second signal is a data signal (cable schedule signals; see Klosterman at column 3, lines 3-17).

As to claim 25, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the first signal is a data signal (satellite schedule signals; see Klosterman at column 3, lines 3-17), and the second signal is a video signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46).

As to claim 26, while Paul discloses a system for delivering to a subscriber a first signal that is subject to a right-of-way franchise fee (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), wherein the method comprises the step of:

(a) means for transmitting (CATV source, 163) a second signal from a first side of the right of way (transmitting cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46), through the right of way, to a second side of the right of way, wherein the first side is opposite the second side (cable television signals crossing the right of way, established by local government to pay video franchise fees, to reach the television subscribers; see Fig. 1) and wherein the second signal is comprised of at least one of a video signal and a data signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46),

(b) means for receiving (satellite dish, 160; Fig. 1) via a wireless communication the first signal on the second side of the right-of-way such that the first signal does not pass through the right-of-way (receiving broadcast satellite signals; column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42) wherein the first signal is comprised of at least one of a video signal and data signal (broadcast satellite signals; column 2, lines 38-59 and column 4, lines 33-42),

(c) means for combining (diplexer, 115) the first signal and the second signal into a combined signal on the second side of the right of way (column 3, lines 23-27 and column 4, lines 33-42),

(d) means for routing (splitters, 116 and 130) the combined signal in the direction of the subscriber (Fig. 1; column 4, lines 39-42 and column 4, lines 59-65), wherein the subscriber is on the second side of the right-of-way (see Fig 1);

(e) means for separating (duplexer, 152) the combined signal into the first signal and the second signal (column 4, lines 59-63); and

(f) means for routing (satellite receiver, 170) the first signal and the second signal to the subscriber (column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), he fails to specifically disclose wherein the first signal does not contain the same type of signal as the second signal.

In an analogous art, Klosterman discloses a television system for receiving signals from two separate sources (Fig. 1A-B; column 3, lines 3-17) wherein each of the transmitted signals includes both video signals and other data signals (television video programming and schedule information; column 3, lines 3-17 and column 5, line 61-column 6, line 67) for the typical benefit of providing viewers with a schedule of available programming (column 1, lines 16-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul's system to include wherein the first signal does not contain the same type of signal as the second signal, as taught by Klosterman, for the typical benefit of providing viewers with additional data with their video transmissions, in the form of a schedule of available programming.

As to claim 27, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the first signal is a video signal (satellite television signals; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 28), and the second signal is a data signal (cable schedule signals; see Klosterman at column 3, lines 3-17).

As to claim 28, Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the first signal is a data signal (satellite schedule signals; see Klosterman at column 3, lines 3-17), and the second signal is a video signal (cable television signals; Fig. 1; column 1, line 66-column 2, line 46).

As to claims 17 and 21, while Paul and Klosterman disclose receiving the first electronic signal from a satellite receiver and transmitting them to the multiplexer (see Fig. 1; column 5, lines 46-64), they fail to specifically disclose converting the signals to optical signals for transmission across fiber optic wires.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of invention by applicant to convert and transmit signals across fiber optic lines, as opposed to copper or coaxial cables, as fiber optic cables can carry much more information in wires which are smaller and lighter than conventional wiring, for the typical benefit of utilizing a transmission medium which can carry additional information through smaller lighter wires.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul and Klosterman's system to include converting the signals to optical signals for transmission across fiber optic wires for the typical benefit

of utilizing a transmission medium which can carry additional information through smaller lighter wires.

5. Claims 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

As to claim 7, while Paul discloses a multiplexer to combine video and data signals, he fails to specifically disclose a wave division multiplexer.

Applicant's conceded that the prior art discloses the use of a wave division multiplexer (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) when combining video and data signals for distribution over an optical network (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) which is smaller and lighter than traditional copper and coaxial cables but can carry much more information (see specification at page 2, paragraph 2) to transmit the video and data signals over different frequencies (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire (paragraph 13) which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire (paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul's system to include a wave division multiplexer, as taught by applicant's conceded prior art, for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire.

As to claim 9, while Paul discloses a multiplexer to combine a first video signal and a second data signal at different wavelengths, he fails to specifically disclose wherein the first signal is transmitted over a 1550 nanometer wavelength and the second signal is transmitted over a 1310 nanometer wavelength.

Applicant's conceded that the prior art discloses the use of multiplexer (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) when combining video and data signals for distribution over an optical network (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) which is smaller and lighter than traditional copper and coaxial cables but can carry much more information (see specification at page 2, paragraph 2) to transmit a first video signal over a 1550 nanometer wavelength (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) and a second data signal over a 1310-nanometer wavelength (see Applicant's specification at page 5, paragraph 13) for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire (paragraph 13) which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire (paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul's system to include wherein the first signal is transmitted over a 1550 nanometer wavelength and the second signal is transmitted over a 1310 nanometer wavelength, as taught by applicant's conceded prior art, for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire.

6. Claims 13-16, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul and Klosterman and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

As to claim 22, while Paul and Klosterman disclose a multiplexer to combine video and data signals, he fails to specifically disclose a wave division multiplexer.

Applicant's conceded that the prior art discloses the use of a wave division multiplexer (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) when combining video and data signals for distribution over an optical network (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) which is smaller and lighter than traditional copper and coaxial cables but can carry much more information (see specification at page 2, paragraph 2) to transmit the video and data signals over different frequencies (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire (paragraph 13) which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire (paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul and Klosterman's system to include a wave division multiplexer, as taught by applicant's conceded prior art, for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire.

As to claim 13, while Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the step of combining the first and second signal comprises receiving the first signal and the

second signal at a multiplexer and multiplexing the first signal with the second signal using the multiplexer, they fail to specifically disclose a wave division multiplexer.

Applicant's conceded that the prior art discloses the use of a wave division multiplexer (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) when combining video and data signals for distribution over an optical network (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) which is smaller and lighter than traditional copper and coaxial cables but can carry much more information (see specification at page 2, paragraph 2) to transmit the video and data signals over different frequencies (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire (paragraph 13) which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire (paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul and Klosterman's system to include a wave division multiplexer, as taught by applicant's conceded prior art, for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire.

As to claim 14, Paul, Klosterman and Applicant's admitted prior art disclose wherein the step of routing the combined signal comprises routing the combined signal from the wave division multiplexer to a splitter that is in communication with the subscriber (wherein the cable and satellite signals are separated and transmitted to the

satellite receiver, 170; see Paul at Fig. 1; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9).

As to claim 16, Paul, Klosterman and Applicant's admitted prior art disclose wherein the splitter includes a wave division de-multiplexer (required to separate the wave division multiplexed signals; see Applicant's specification at paragraphs 13-14), and the step of separating the combined signal comprises separating the combined signal with the wave division de-multiplexer (required to separate the wave division multiplexed signals; see Applicant's specification at paragraphs 13-14).

As to claims 15 and 23, while Paul and Klosterman disclose wherein the step of separating the combined signals comprises transmitting the combined signal to a de-multiplexer that separates the combined signal into the first signal and the second signal (wherein the cable and satellite signals are separated and transmitted to the satellite receiver, 170; see Paul at Fig. 1; column 4, lines 33-42 and column 4, line 59-column 5, line 9), they fail to specifically disclose a wave division de-multiplexer.

Applicant's conceded that the prior art discloses the use of a wave division multiplexer (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) when combining video and data signals for distribution over an optical network (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13) which is smaller and lighter than traditional copper and coaxial cables but can carry much more information (see specification at page 2, paragraph 2) to transmit the video and data signals over different frequencies (see specification at page 5, paragraph 13)

to a wave division de-multiplexer (required to separate the wave division multiplexed signals; see Applicant's specification at paragraphs 13-14) for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire (paragraph 13) which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire (paragraph 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to modify Paul and Klosterman's system to include a wave division de-multiplexer, as taught by applicant's conceded prior art, for the benefit of ensuring that the data and video signals to be distinguished from one another over a fiber optic wire which carries more information over a smaller lighter wire.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments that Paul only describes combining and delivering video signals, it is noted that the claims merely require a video signal and a "data" signal. As the broad term data clearly encompasses "video data", applicant's arguments are not convincing. Video is a form of data. Further, there is no limitation as

to what form the data must take, or that it must somehow be non-video data, as applicant suggests.

Further, in response to applicant's arguments that Paul fails to disclose an optical network unit, it is noted that Paul was never relied upon to disclose an optical network unit. Paul was modified to include an optical network unit so as to take advantage of the benefits provided by a fiber optic transmission network. Thus, applicant's arguments are not convincing.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in

Art Unit: 2623

such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. () _____ - _____ on _____
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Signature: _____

Registration Number: _____

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Sheleheda whose telephone number is (571) 272-7357. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James Sheleheda
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2623

JS


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600